REMARKS

Claim 1 is revised in a further effort to define a patentable embodiment, relative to the applied art. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 28, and 29 remain, with no claim being previously allowed

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 29 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Bouve* (5,682,525) in view of *Hancock* (6,202,023). The applicants respectfully traverse that rejection as possibly applied to amended Claim 1 and the claims depending thereon.

The revisions to Claim 1 are intended to further distinguish the embodiment of that claim from the teachings of the applied art. That embodiment includes creating a database for storing at least geographical location information for items of interest, and that database creation comprises:

Prompting a user of the mobile communication device to provide a location name for a desired geographical location remote from the present geographic location of the mobile communications device;

receiving geographical location information corresponding to that <u>present</u> geographical location;

comparing the present location with the desired location;

if that desired location is different from the present location, confirming the desired location with the user of the wireless device; and

storing in a database the desired location and the provided location name, for subsequent access by the user.

The foregoing aspects of the method in Claim 1 are described in the specification at Page 20, Lines 3-20, with reference to Figure 7. The method as embodied in amended Claim 1 allows a user to name a geographic location for future reference, and add that geographic location and identifying name to a database, without the user and the mobile wireless device being at that location.

Hancock fails to disclose or suggest a method including the above-discussed elements now in Claim 1. The applicants pointed out in their response filed April 23,

1371180-1 5

2007 that Hancock does not suggest that one of ordinary skill should provide a different geographical location, i.e., different from the present location of the mobile communications device, when creating a database for storing geographical location information. The Examiner's response (Page 10, Office action dated July 16, 2007) asserted that Hancock's predefined location ("Home" or "Office") is the same as the applicants' "previous location...". However, the present amendments to Claim 1 exclude the possibility of interpreting Hancock as in the claimed embodiment. Hancock's predefined locations, which the Examiner interpreted as "previous location of the user's communication device", fails to satisfy the requirements of providing a location name and a desired geographical location remote from the present geographical location of the mobile communications device, comparing the present location with the desired location, confirming the desired location (if different from the present location) with the user, and storing the desired location and location name for subsequent access by the user. Bouve also does not supply that aspect of the method in Claim 1. Accordingly, that claim and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over Bouve in view of Hancock.

Claims 8-11 and 28 are rejected as being unpatentable over *Bouve* and *Hancock*, further in view of *Rennard* (6,615,131). The applicants respectfully traverse that rejection, for the reasons discussed above with respect to parent Claim 1. *Rennard* does not add the elements missing from *Bouve* and *Hancock*, and was not cited for that purpose. Accordingly, dependent Claims 8-11 and 28 are patentable over the applied art for the reasons discussed above.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office action identified above. The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and solicit a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

/Roger T. Frost/

Roger T. Frost, Reg. No. 22,176

39262

Date: October 31, 2007 Merchant & Gould, LLC P.O. Box 2903

Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903 Telephone: 404.954.5039